

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

AGENDA

The next meeting of the
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)
will be as follows.

Date: Thursday, September 27, 2007
7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
Place: San Mateo City Hall
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, California
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL TOM MADALENA (599-1460) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- | | | | | |
|----|---|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. | Call To Order. | Action
(Alfano) | | 7:30 p.m.
(5 mins) |
| 2. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda. | Presentations are
limited to 3 mins
per speaker. | | 7:35 p.m.
(5 mins) |
| 3. | Minutes of June 28, 2007 Meeting. | Action
(Alfano) | Pages 1-4 | 7:40 p.m.
(5 mins) |
| 4. | Recommendations for the FY 08/09 TDA Article 3 Program | Action
(Hoang) | Page 5 | 7:45 p.m.
(20 mins) |
| 5. | Approval of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map | Action
(Shu) | Pages 6-25 | 8:05 p.m.
(20 mins) |
| 6. | Review and approval of the 2008 BPAC meeting calendar | Action
(Madalena) | Page 26 | 8:25 p.m.
(5 mins) |
| 7. | Member Recognition | Information
(Madalena) | Oral
presentation | 8:30 p.m.
(20 mins) |
| 8. | Member Communications | Information
(Alfano) | | 8:50 p.m.
(5 mins) |
| 9. | Communications (for information only) | | Page 27 | |

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

10. Adjournment	Action (Alfano)	8:55 p.m. (5 mins)
-----------------	--------------------	-----------------------

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

Other enclosures/Correspondence

- None.

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Richard Napier at 650-599-1420 or Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460.

NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

The following BPAC meeting will be held on Thursday October 25th, 2007.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
June 28, 2007

1. Call to Order.

Chair Alfano called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting to order at 7:38 p.m.

Members Attending:

Michael Barnes, Cathy Baylock, Robert Cronin, Mike Harding, Marc Hershman, Ken Ibarra, Judi Mosqueda, Julie Lancelle, Naomi Patridge, and Mark Meadows.

Staff/Guests Attending:

Sandy Wong, Tom Madalena, Rich Napier, Diana Shu, Al Meckler, Susanna Chan

2. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.

None.

3. Minutes of the March 22, 2007 Meeting.

Motion: Member Baylock moved/member Hershman seconded approval of the March 22, 2007 minutes. Motion carried with Ken Ibarra abstaining from the vote.

4. Discussion on Funding Criteria for the Measure A Half Cent Sales Tax Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

Joe Hurley from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) presented this item per the public request for more bicycle and pedestrian projects.

There will be approximately 45 million dollars available with 1.8 million dollars being available per year for 25 years. Looking at it from a programmatic perspective, the TA wanted feedback from BPAC to take back to make a recommendation for adoption into the strategic plan. The TA is looking to make it equitable. The TA is trying to leverage as much as possible. They could require that the Measure A money only be available for construction. Would that be appropriate? Money goes further and project sponsors have more vested interest since they spend money up front. Should there be Specific criteria? Same as the BPAC/CMA uses, same as MTC, does this generate the best projects for the County?

This could be distributed based purely on population. To be used on specific purposes and would include a yearly audit. The timely use of funds, project readiness, will be a key component. Bike and pedestrian split, should there be one? Should maintenance be an eligible expense? Measure A funds cannot be used to replace an existing funding source. Will also need to make sure that transit becomes a more appealing mode of transportation, improved access to transit centers.

Comments:

Maintenance may fall under major project anyway as they have before and would be eligible.

Member Hershman – Knowing that we have 1.8 million available may be nice since we will have the opportunity to fund some big projects. Maybe we should keep it together to have some big projects.

Chair Alfano- agreed w/ member Hershman, there are some big projects that could be funded. The 50/50 split could be used as maintenance of the projects that have been funded.

BPAC agreed that the split idea is not good. They liked having the larger chunk of money that would be competitive.

Joe Hurley – how would we deal with the geographic equity issue?

In the past the BPAC has dealt with that through the competitive process. Smaller dollar amounts have been a problem in the past. Too small amounts do not end up getting used, and are more difficult to administer.

Member Harding – Would like to endorse the idea of funding multi year groups in order to have money available to fund larger projects and not have to do partial funding.

Chair Alfano – Brisbane great project but had to be partially funded. Smaller projects that scored well last time in TDA round did not get funded since there was not enough money due to really high scoring large projects.

Two-year cycle seems to be the recommended idea since there would be approximately 3.6 million dollars available. Maintenance is on the table per the BPAC. The money should be used for construction.

It might be a good idea to set aside money for planning. How much for design? Joe wants to have criteria and get away from making decisions on a case-by-case basis. If we only do construction then the applicants have to be serious about the projects. The scoring is currently geared for construction. When there is money provided as the match then there is more commitment. Perhaps the scoring criteria should be looked at to make sure that planning projects could be funded. Time limits are a good item to make sure that the money does not get tied up and not used.

Cities/County are generally the sponsors and SamTrans should be eligible too. BPAC is comfortable with the current criteria. Amount of funding has been the issue that has occurred in the past.

There should be flexibility with planning projects, not a set aside percentage of money for planning projects. Perhaps the criteria should be evaluated to address planning projects. This could be an item for further discussion.

5. Discussion on Bicycle Route Network and Facilities

Member Cronin – Looking for a way for applicants to apply for less glamorous but useful projects. Maintenance may be brought in through Measure A. BPAC could notify the Cities that we could fund maintenance projects. In certain cities it is difficult to get through due to the fact that bikes are required to run red lights. There are issues with the fact that many of the signals are controlled by Caltrans and the loop detectors do not operate properly. There are issues with both the sensitivity as well as the location of the loop. Perhaps they could be adjusted through the control box or they could stencil the loop detectors so that bicyclists could be aware of the location.

Chair Alfano – We could add something to the letter that goes out for TDA, for Cities to look at their facilities to see if there are any current issues with facilities.

Member Cronin – There should be attention paid to the network of bike lanes instead of larger projects. There could be more emphasis on the improving connectivity and bridging gaps in the network.

Member Meadows – Could we have the public safety groups help push for the maintenance of the existing loop detectors, etc? We should entice or encourage the smaller projects. These are mainly maintenance issues. BPAC could encourage the maintenance type projects as they could be funded through TDA 3.

Perhaps BPAC could welcome other BPAC's to come and talk to us about their concerns and issues that they are dealing with which would help foster dialogue.

We could send a letter to BPAC's requesting them to discuss their concerns with us. Naomi thought that this could put the advisory members from other communities in an awkward position.

Chair Alfano motion – To ask staff to prepare a letter to encourage cities to evaluate existing facilities (bike/ped) for functionality and ask them to maintain them. Also make them aware of Measure A funding to consider larger scale maintenance funding and understand that maintenance projects are eligible. They could aggregate facilities upgrade projects that could no longer be maintained. Amended by member Barnes to include - Cities should be reminded that if they submit maintenance projects those would count toward their three project limit.

Seconded by member Lancelle and the motion carried unanimously.

6. Review and Recommendation on Improvements to the TDA Article 3 Process

Sandy Wong presented this item. There was some concern about ADA ramp type projects for TDA Article 3. Some cities set aside general funds to take care of these ADA needs, other do not have the funds. There were Planning projects that were really good but the BPAC could not score them well based on the scoring criteria.

Member Meadows – if we open up planning projects it could be difficult to create a separate set of scoring criteria and we could fund planning projects that do not actually bring forward

construction projects.

Member Lancelle - If we do have planning funding set aside it should be a small number like 10%.

The scoring criteria will need to be revised to include scoring criteria to reflect planning projects. This will need to be an agenda item in the future to have a proper discussion. There could be punitive measures for funding planning projects if they do not bring forward projects that end up being endorsed by their community.

Member Baylock – The City should have to bring forward a plan to be eligible. The city needs to do the planning work first.

The current scoring criteria is geared for construction. If we are to fund planning projects there should be a separate scoring criteria for “planning projects”.

7. Recommendation on the Approval of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map

Diana Shu presented this item. The Bike Map Subcommittee would like to have the existing routes checked as well as to define the Class I, 2, 3. Per the Bike Map Subcommittee, the data is to be collected by August 1st, 2007. Then this data will be placed into the GIS layer. Chevrons are to be used instead of colors to show gradient. The routes should be shown in a more visible color such as red. The assignment is to return by the next meeting a copy of the validation maps by cities.

Motion by Chair Alfano – Move to extend the process to the next meeting at which point the members should come back with validated versions of the map so that the subcommittee could have a route layer that could be provided to the approved bidder for the RFP. Seconded by member Barnes and the motion carried unanimously.

8. Member Communications

None

10. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Chair Alfano and seconded by member Lancelle. The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 pm.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 27, 2007
To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
From: John Hoang
Subject: Recommendations for the FY 08/09 TDA Article 3 Program
(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee recommend guidelines for the FY 08/09 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

Funding for the FY 2008/09 cycle is approximately \$600,000.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

TDA Article 3 funds are derived from the following sources:

- Local Transportation Funds (LTF) - from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide.
- State Transit Assistance fund (STA) - from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

TDA Article 3 funds are allocated to San Mateo County each fiscal year for bicycle and pedestrian related projects. In the past few years, the BPAC had decided to combine funding over two cycles. For the upcoming FY 08/09 funding cycle, staff is requesting that the BPAC consider whether to proceed with a call for projects or rollover the funds to the FY 09/10 cycle.

If the BPAC decides to proceed with a project solicitation process for FY 08/09, then it is recommended that a review of the project application and scoring guidelines be performed before the application packets are released. This process should begin next month. The applications would be mailed out to agencies in November 2007 for the FY 08/09 cycle. If the BPAC decides to rollover the funds to the FY 09/10 Cycle, then no immediate actions will be required.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Proceed with a TDA Art 3 FY 08/09 Program with approximately \$600,000.
2. Rollover the TDA Art 3 FY 08/09 funding into FY 09/10.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 27, 2007
To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
From: Diana Shu, Transportation Systems Coordinator
Subject: Approval of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map

(For further information contact Diana Shu at 599-1414)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee approve the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map so that staff may begin solicitations.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Partial funding for this project has been included in the FY 07-08 Budget.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the June 28, 2007 committee meeting, members decided to postpone the release of the RFP for a bike map until the current bikeways layer could be reviewed and updated to identify Class I, II, and III routes. The committee felt that the inclusion of the route classification was necessary to delineate user bikeways from city/county official bikeways.

Since June, committee members have volunteered to verify data in the field against the current GIS layer. Both user bikeways and official bikeways in various cities as listed on the attached document have been verified.

Staff is currently loading this data onto the GIS layer as follows:

- Existing bikeways classified and not classified.
- City proposed bikeways.

Staff estimates that much of this work can be done in house with the data that has been received to date. There is still data that has not been collected and volunteers will be needed to address these areas unless the committee recommends otherwise.

Meanwhile, staff is recommending that the RFP process begin in parallel with the data upload as it may take several months to advertise, interview, and award the contract. It is anticipated that the bikeways layer will be completed in time to award the contract.

ATTACHMENTS

- Request for Proposals for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map
- Signup sheet (volunteers to verify, in the field, the accuracy of the GIS layer)
- List of copies of Bike Maps collected from jurisdictions

ALTERNATIVES

1. That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee approve the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map so that staff may begin solicitations.
2. That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee approve the Request for Proposals (RFP), with modifications, for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map so that staff may begin solicitations.
3. Postpone to next meeting.
4. Take no action.

Signup Sheet for People who have volunteered to review the current bikeway information				http://www.ccaq.ca.gov/bpac_docs&maps.html		
Acrobat Version of paper map can be found at this website:						
Jurisdiction	Primary Reviewer	Contact Info	Secondary Reviewer	Contact Info	Data Received	Data Updated
ATHERTON	Robert Cronin	shawms@bigvalley.net			9/12/2007	9/19/2007
BELMONT						
BRISBANE	Michael Barnes	mgb5@mindspring.com			9/19/2007	
BURLINGAME	Maureen Brooks	MBrooks@burlingame.org			9/10/2007	9/17/2007
COLMA	Cory Roay				9/10/2007	9/17/2007
DALY CITY	Cory Roay					
EAST PALO ALTO						
FOSTER CITY						
HALF MOON BAY	Mike Harding	Mike.Harding@varian.com			9/17/2007	
HILLSBOROUGH	Maureen Brooks	MBrooks@burlingame.org				
MENLO PARK	Robert Cronin	shawms@bigvalley.net			9/12/2007	9/19/2007
MILLBRAE						
PACIFICA	Mike Harding	Mike.Harding@varian.com			9/17/2007	
PORTOLA VALLEY	Robert Cronin	shawms@bigvalley.net			9/12/2007	9/19/2007
REDWOOD CITY						
SAN BRUNO						
SAN CARLOS						
SAN MATEO	Maureen Brooks	MBrooks@burlingame.org			9/19/2007	
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	Mike Harding	Mike.Harding@varian.com			9/17/2007	9/18/2007
WOODSIDE	Robert Cronin	shawms@bigvalley.net		Didrik Hoag (PBPC)	9/12/2007	9/19/2007
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO (Coastside)	Mike Harding	Mike.Harding@varian.com			9/17/2007	
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO (Bayside)						
Kings Mtn	Dave Alfano	dda@gamasot.net				
N S Route only (San Bruno-SSF)	Mike Harding	Mike.Harding@varian.com		(PBPC)	9/17/2007	

Copy of Bike Map from Jurisdictions					
Identifying which trails are classified and which are proposed.					
Call Diana Shu at 650-599-1414 if you wish to access this information.					
Jurisdiction	Will send	Received	Sent Thankyou	Contact	
ATHERTON					
BELMONT					
BRISBANE					
BURLINGAME				Maureen Brooks	
COLMA	yes	pdf	yes	Suzanne Giesin	
DALY CITY					
EAST PALO ALTO	maybe				
FOSTER CITY					
HALF MOON BAY	yes	yes hard copy	yes	Mike Blondino	
HILLSBOROUGH					
MENLO PARK	yes	yes hard copy	yes	Richard Angulo	
MILLBRAE	yes	pdf	yes	Khee Lim	
PACIFICA	yes	yes hard copy	yes	Michael Crabtree	
PORTOLA VALLEY					
REDWOOD CITY					
SAN BRUNO					
SAN CARLOS	yes	pdf	yes	parviz Mokhtari	
SAN MATEO	yes	shape files	yes	Patrick Crevett	
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO					
WOODSIDE					
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO					

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR A SAN MATEO COUNTY BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION MAP

Requested by
C/CAG
City/ County Association of Governments
of
San Mateo County

Submittal Date:

October 26, 2007 by 5:00 p.m.

To

Diana Shu

C/CAG of San Mateo County
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
dshu@co.sanmateo.ca.us
650-599-1414

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
FOR A
SAN MATEO COUNTY
BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION MAP**

GENERAL

The City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County is seeking proposals for professional cartographic services to update the San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map. The current map was produced in 1998.

The main goal of this project is to produce a foldable paper map of San Mateo County bicycle facilities (routes, paths, lanes, bike ways) that clearly delineates bicycle facilities in the county and its relationship to other features (schools, train stations, etc.). C/CAG will provide the bicycle facility information to the successful candidate. This map is intended to be a bicycle transportation map that identifies both official bicycle facilities as well as user defined bicycle facilities.

C/CAG and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) will be evaluating these proposals. Depending on the funding requirements, all or a portion of the listed deliverables, as described below, will be selected for the final project.

Interested parties should submit information regarding their firm's qualifications for this project including information about sub consultants or sub contractors, if any, and samples of relevant work. C/CAG is particularly interested in samples related to San Mateo County. Additional information regarding the scope of services, schedules, fees, and future capabilities as listed in the Appendix A are also required.

Successful candidates will be selected on the basis of the quality of their work and past experience.

SCOPE OF WORK

Paper Map

Develop a general map similar to the enclosed Bicycle Transportation Map of the San Francisco Peninsula San Mateo County (existing map), standard foldable map, with current bicycle facility information and associated features as described below.

Base Map with GIS Layers

C/CAG currently has San Mateo County Bicycle Facilities identified in a data file that can be exported upon request. A partial data set can be made available in Oracle Object Model, Arc View Shapefile, Microsoft ACCESS, or other commonly used GIS data formats. The successful consultant will be given the full data set for use on this project.

Please note that while the data is currently stored in Geomedia, this project does not need to use Geomedia, other cartographic applications may be used. C/CAG welcomes all applications. Having Geomedia or the ability to use data exported from Geomedia will only help facilitate the data transfer. Therefore, the consultant should identify the type of application to be used for this project in the proposal.

The consultant shall provide a base map with layers that clearly and legibly identifies:

1. All roads, road names, major routes, highways
2. Schools
3. Public buildings
4. Hospitals
5. BART and/or Train stations
6. Public Parks, state parks and wildlife refuges
7. Existing bike facilities and trails
8. Legends and other information listed on the existing map with updated information as required. Symbols shall conform to those used on the existing map. Other symbols may be used if they enhance the legibility of the map. Include also notes (eg: difficult intersection, best route, etc.) shown on existing map.
9. Bike facility gradients using chevrons (pointing uphill) to illustrate the direction and relative steepness of grade.

Optional, preferred but not required layers, which identifies:

10. Bike facilities at 2000 feet beyond the borders of the county limits
11. Identify dirt roads
12. Public restrooms
13. Distances between intersections of major arterials (in miles)
14. Bicycle shops

Consultant shall provide a sample of the base map for San Mateo County with as many of the above requested features as possible that is best suited for this project with the proposal.

Paper Map

A 40" x 28" (or C/CAG approved size) paper map which can be folded into a 4"x 9" easy to carry size is required. Color and paper type shall conform to those on the existing map enclosed in this proposal. Other colors and paper will be considered. Please provide samples.

Note: if there is a substantial cost differential for number of colors, line types, etc. please provide a breakdown and sample, if possible. C/CAG is interested in a bicycle transportation map that clearly delineates bicycle facilities from roadways while at the same time allow roadways to be shown as key landmarks for the traveling bicyclist.

Quantity of Map

Estimated costs for printing maps should include line item costs for:

- Initial setup
- Printing for bulk quantities of 5,000, 10,000 and 20,000 copies
- Printing for 10, 100, 500 copies
- Shipping for above quantities

Distribute Map

C/CAG may wish to have these maps distributed to certain public facilities such as local bike shops, libraries, and civic centers. Please provide estimated costs for shipping or delivering set quantities to these types of facilities. C/CAG staff will provide addresses after the project has been awarded.

Deliverables

75% Draft Set – provide 10 color copies of bicycle transportation map, as defined above for review and comment and one softcopy of the modified bicycle facility information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92 (see Footnote About Geomedia), or approved equal.

90% Check Set – provide 5 color copies of bicycle transportation map, as required for backcheck, and one softcopy of the modified bicycle facility information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

100% Proof set – provide 2 color copies of bicycle transportation map, for review prior to final printing and one softcopy of the modified bicycle facility information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

Final set – provide color hardcopies, in quantities requested, and one softcopy of the final bicycle facilities information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

Footnote about Geomedia

Our current version of Geomedia allows us to connect to spatial data created in the following formats:

- Access
- MGE Segment Manager (MGSM)
- ARC/INFO
- ArcView shapefile
- ODBC Tabular
- CAD – AutoCAD and MicroStation®/IGDS
- Oracle® Object Model
- FRAMME™
- SQL Server
- MapInfo
- SmartStore Server
- Modular GIS Environment (MGE)
- Text File Server
- MGE Data Manager (MGDM)

As noted above, those responding to the RFP should contact Diana Shu if further clarification is needed about the bicycle facility data on Geomedia. This project does not need to use Geomedia, other cartographic applications may be used. C/CAG welcomes all reasonable proposals.

C/CAG is also interested in obtaining rights to the completed map. C/CAG would like to retain the right to publish, and reproduce, the completed map. This proposal shall state whether or not this is possible and to what extent. C/CAG recognizes that this may be an issue for some consultants but would like to understand if arrangements can be made or which options are available. Selection of the consultant will not be based on the ability to obtain these rights.

Future Phases of This Project

This is not part of this scope of work but we ask that your firm consider how it can help us with Phases A, B, and C listed below and as described on the attached pages.

C/CAG is considering future phases of the bicycle map project. Those phases include the following:

- A. Bicycle Facility Map Data Maintenance Application
 - a. Develop a Geomedia (or similar graphical interface) workflow for bicycle facility information that can be easily maintained by C/CAG staff or other designated support staff.
- B. Online Bicycle Facilities
 - b. Upload bicycle facility data onto the Metropolitan Transportation Commission online bicycle facility site 511.org
 - c. Provide updated information to MTC as required by C/CAG Staff
- C. Proposed Bicycle Facility Paper Map
 - d. Develop area specific general maps with current and proposed bicycle facility information on standard 8.5" x 11" paper to be inserted into the revised San Mateo Comprehensive Bicycle General Plan. C/CAG will provide the consultant with the proposed bicycle facility information.

In your proposal, please describe how your final bicycle facilities dataset will benefit or impact, if any, the next phases of this project.

Phase A
Bicycle Facility Map
Data Maintenance Application

Develop a Geomedia, or other approved application, workflow for bicycle facility information that can be easily maintained by C/CAG staff or designated technical support staff.

Workflow or software application user interface

Develop a process by which C/CAG staff or designated technical staff can update bicycle facilities as required when new bicycle facilities are identified or developed.

This process may be any one or more of the following:

1. An instruction manual guiding the user through Geomedia, or other approved application, on how to enter new bicycle facilities, or to delete selected old bicycle facilities. Please specify application to be used.
2. Develop a workflow, simplified user interface or electronic data editing form in Geomedia, or other approved application, that will allow the user to update bicycle trails. Please identify the software application to be used.

Possible Deliverables

Instruction manual -for updating bicycle facilities on current electronic file; include one hard and one soft copy of draft set and one final set.

Workflow, or electronic data editing form - associated with updating facilities on the bicycle map database (optional).

Phase B Online Bicycle Facilities

Part I – MTC 511.org

Upload bicycle facility data onto the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) online bicycle map site 511.org and provide updated information to MTC as required by C/CAG staff.

Online interactive mapping

Coordinate with MTC staff on the 511.org website support to upload the C/CAG bicycle facility information on an as needed basis. Provide data that is compatible with current MTC 511.org website requirements. For this proposal, assume that all bicycle facilities are Class III only and no more than one upload per year. Future updates, may include more accurate classifications as provided by C/CAG or BPAC staff.

Work with C/CAG staff to maintain bicycle facility information on an annual basis that can be easily uploaded onto the MTC 511.org website.

Possible Deliverables

Allow the public to access bicycle facility information on existing website for bicyclists – provide data to MTC 511.org website and provide softcopy of same data to C/CAG staff.

Maintain data on 511.org – update on annual basis assuming that the data format and or upload requirements remains unchanged from its current MTC configuration.

Part II – Acrobat (.pdf) Open Access Version on C/CAG Website

C/CAG staff may also wish to post an Acrobat (.pdf) open access version, or other static version of this map on the C/CAG website for users to download all or a portion of the map for their use. Consultant may submit a separate estimate of the cost of providing C/CAG with an Acrobat (.pdf) or other application version of this map and associated license fees, if any along with this proposal. Consultant should provide samples of this work if similar work has been done.

Possible Deliverables

Acrobat (.pdf) version – provide final version of map in Acrobat (.pdf) open access version or other static format for C/CAG staff to post on C/CAG website for general distribution.

Phase C

Proposed Bicycle Facility Paper Map

Using the base map and layers developed for the paper map, develop another set of paper maps with existing and proposed bicycle facility information. The output of this set of maps will be by city and will need to be printed onto standard 8.5" x 11" size sheets to be inserted into the revised San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle General Plan document which will be prepared by others.

Currently, the raw data for the proposed facilities are available on paper format. Only a portion of this data is in an electronic format. The information may be described in a text file, on paper maps, or in Geomedia. For the purposes of this proposal, assume that the information will be provided on a marked up copy of the current bicycle map. C/CAG staff will provide this data.

Possible Deliverables

Proof set – provide 10 color copies of proposed bicycle facilities, by city, on 8.5" x 11" sheets to C/CAG and/or BPAC committee for review prior to final printing and one softcopy in Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

Final set – provide 5 color hardcopies, one softcopy in a reproducible file and, one softcopy in Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

Proposals

Proposals shall include the following information at minimum:

- 1) Please provide a description of scope of services as stated in above request.
 - a. Tasks to be performed and who will do the work: prime or sub consultant.
 - b. Include information on software applications, if any, used for this project and its compatibility with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92
 - c. Description of deliverables, proposed delivery schedule, and cost estimate on the form provided in Appendix A of this proposal
- 2) Describe the level of experience on relevant projects
 - a. Provide one or two samples of relevant work if available.
 - b. Provide contact information
 - c. Attach schedule of fees

Provide four (4) hard copies, one set of samples, and one electronic version of your proposal by October 26th, 2007 by 5:00 p.m. to my attention:

Diana Shu
C/CAG of San Mateo County
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
650-599-1414
dshu@co.sanmateo.ca.us

Attachments

San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map
Appendix A Schedule and Cost Estimates
Appendix B Sample Standard Contract Form

Appendix A
Schedule and Cost Estimates

No.	Deliverable	Schedule in Weeks	Cost to Produce
1.0	Paper Map		
1.1	Base map with required GIS layers as defined in items 1 to 8 on pg 3		
	Bike facility gradients using chevrons to illustrate the direction and relative steepness of grade. (item 9 on pg 3)		
1.2	Optional GIS layers:		
	Bike facilities at 2000 feet beyond the borders of the county limits		
	Identify dirt roads		
	Public restrooms		
	Distances between intersections of major arterials (in miles)		
	Bicycle shops		
	Paper Map		
	Initial setup cost for paper map		
	Printing and shipping for bulk quantities:		
	Quantity = 5,000		
	Quantity = 10,000		
	Quantity = 20,000		
	Printing and shipping for limited quantities		
	Quantity = 10		
	Quantity = 100		
	Quantity = 500		
1.3	75% draft set		
1.4	90% check set		
1.5	100% proof set		
1.6	Final Set with 1 copy		
1.7	Estimated "Not to exceed amount" to complete project (w/o prints)		
1.8	Rights to publish and reproduce	Yes/No/Maybe	

Appendix A (continued)

No.	Future Phases: Benefit or Impact
2.0	Phase A: Bicycle Facility Map Data Maintenance Application
3.0	Phase B: Online Bicycle Facilities
4.0	Phase C: Proposed Bicycle Facility Paper Map

ATTACHMENT B
SAMPLE

AGREEMENT BETWEEN
CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS AND _____

This Agreement entered this ____ Day of _____, 2007, by and between the CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, a joint powers agency formed for the purpose of preparation, adoption and monitoring of a variety of county-wide state-mandated plans, hereinafter called "C/CAG" and _____, hereinafter called "Contractor."

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, C/CAG is a joint powers agency formed for the purpose of preparation, adoption and monitoring of a variety of county-wide state-mandated plans; and,

WHEREAS, C/CAG is prepared to award funding for developing a Bicycle Facility Map for San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, C/CAG has determined that Contractor has the requisite qualifications to perform this work.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED by the parties as follows:

1. Services to be provided by Contractor. In consideration of the payments hereinafter set forth, Consultant agrees to perform the services described in Exhibit A.
2. Payments. In consideration of Contractor providing the assistance and services authorized by C/CAG staff, C/CAG shall reimburse Consultant based on acceptance of deliverables and fee schedules set forth in Exhibit A up to a maximum amount of _____.
3. Relationship of the Parties. It is understood that this is an Agreement by and between Independent Contractor(s) and is not intended to, and shall not be construed to, create the relationship of agent, servant, employee, partnership, joint venture or association, or any other relationship whatsoever other than that of Independent Contractor.
4. Non-Assignability. Contractor shall not assign this Agreement or any portion thereof to a third party without the prior written consent of C/CAG, and any attempted assignment without such prior written consent in violation of this Section automatically shall terminate this Agreement.
5. Contract Term. This Agreement shall be in effect as of _____ and shall terminate on _____; provided, however, the C/CAG Chairperson may terminate this Agreement at any time for any reason by providing 30 days' notice to Contractor. Termination to be effective on the date specified in the notice. In the event of

termination under this paragraph, Contractor shall be paid for all approved deliverables provided by the date of termination.

6. Hold Harmless/ Indemnity: Contractor shall indemnify and save harmless C/CAG from all claims, suits or actions resulting from the performance by Contractor of its duties under this Agreement. C/CAG shall indemnify and save harmless Contractor from all claims, suits or actions resulting from the performance by C/CAG of its duties under this Agreement.

The duty of the parties to indemnify and save harmless as set forth herein, shall include the duty to defend as set forth in Section 2778 of the California Civil Code.

7. Insurance: Contractor or its subcontractors performing the services on behalf of Contractor shall not commence work under this Agreement until all Insurance required under this section has been obtained and such insurance has been approved by the C/CAG Staff. Contractor shall furnish the C/CAG Staff with Certificates of Insurance evidencing the required coverage and there shall be a specific contractual liability endorsement extending the Contractor's coverage to include the contractual liability assumed by the Contractor pursuant to this Agreement. These Certificates shall specify or be endorsed to provide that thirty (30) days notice must be given, in writing, to C/CAG of any pending change in the limits of liability or of non-renewal, cancellation, or modification of the policy.

Workers' Compensation and Employer Liability Insurance: Contractor shall have in effect, during the entire life of this Agreement, Workers' Compensation and Employer Liability Insurance providing full statutory coverage.

Liability Insurance: Contractor shall take out and maintain during the life of this Agreement such Bodily Injury Liability and Property Damage Liability Insurance as shall protect the Alliance, its employees, officers and agents while performing work covered by this Agreement from any and all claims for damages for bodily injury, including accidental death, as well as any and all operations under this Agreement, whether such operations be by the Contractor or by any sub-contractor or by anyone directly or indirectly employed by either of them. Such insurance shall be combined single limit bodily injury and property damage for each occurrence and shall be not less than \$1,000,000 unless another amount is specified below and shows approval by C/CAG Staff.

Required insurance shall include:

	Required Amount	Approval by C/CAG Staff if under \$ 1,000,000
a. Comprehensive General Liability	\$ 1,000,000	_____
b. Workers' Compensation	\$ Statutory	_____

C/CAG and its officers, agents, employees and servants shall be named as additional insured on any such policies of insurance, which shall also contain a provision that the insurance afforded thereby to C/CAG, its officers, agents, employees and servants shall be primary insurance to the full limits of liability of the policy, and that if C/CAG, or its officers and employees have other insurance against a loss covered by such a policy, such other insurance shall be excess insurance only.

In the event of the breach of any provision of this section, or in the event any notice is received which indicates any required insurance coverage will be diminished or canceled, the C/CAG Chairperson, at his/her option, may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement to the contrary, immediately declare a material breach of this Agreement and suspend all further work pursuant to this Agreement.

8. Non-discrimination. The Contractor and its subcontractors performing the services on behalf of the Contractor shall not discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons on the basis or race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, pregnancy, childbirth or related conditions, medical condition, mental or physical disability or veteran's status, or in any manner prohibited by federal, state or local laws.
9. Accessibility of Services to Disabled Persons. The Contractor, not C/CAG, shall be responsible for compliance with all applicable requirements regarding services to disabled persons, including any requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
10. Substitutions: If particular people are identified in this Agreement are providing services under this Agreement, the Contractor will not assign others to work in their place without written permission from C/CAG. Any substitution shall be with a person of commensurate experience and knowledge.
11. Sole Property of C/CAG: Any system, product, or documents developed, produced or provided under this Agreement shall become the sole property of C/CAG. C/CAG shall retain the right to publish, reproduce, and edit all data associated with the development of this bicycle map.
12. Agreement Renewal. This Agreement may be renewed for an additional two (2) years upon approval by the C/CAG Board and Contractor.
13. Access to Records. C/CAG, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Contractor which are directly pertinent to this Agreement for the purpose of making audit, examination, excerpts, and transcriptions.

The Contractor shall maintain all required records for three years after C/CAG makes final payments and all other pending matters are closed.

14. Merger Clause. This Agreement, including Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated

herein by reference, constitutes the sole agreement of the parties hereto with regard to the matters covered in this Agreement, and correctly states the rights, duties and obligations of each party as of the document's date. Any prior agreement, promises, negotiations or representations between the parties not expressly stated in this document are not binding. All subsequent modifications shall be in writing and signed by the C/CAG Chairperson. In the event of a conflict between the terms, conditions or specifications set forth herein and those in Exhibit A attached hereto, the terms, conditions or specifications set forth herein shall prevail.

15. **Governing Law.** This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and any suit or action initiated by either party shall be brought in the County of San Mateo, California.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have affixed their hands on the day and year first above written.

Contractor

By _____ Date _____

Contractor Legal Counsel

By _____

City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)

By _____ Date _____
Deborah C. Gordon, C/CAG Chair

C/CAG Legal Counsel

By _____
Miruni Soosaipillai, C/CAG Counsel

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 27, 2007
To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
From: Tom Madalena
Subject: Review and approval of the 2008 BPAC meeting calendar
(For further information please contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee review and approve the 2008 BPAC meeting calendar.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The schedule for regular meetings in 2008 will be as follows:

Time: 7:30-9:30 p.m.
Location: San Mateo City Hall
Conference Room C
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

January 24
February off
March 27
April off
May 22
June 26
July off
August off
September 25
October 23
November off
December off

The scheduled meetings are on the fourth Thursday of the month.

From: "Mark Eliot" <mark@eliotlabs.org>
To: "Tom Madalena" <tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Date: 6/27/2007 10:38 AM
Subject: TDA-3 clarification

Hi Tom,

I'm looking for some clarification of the TDA Article 3 project funding criteria for San Mateo County. According to objective #12 in the "Call for Projects" notice referenced below, C/CAG will fund bicycle and pedestrian plans. However, I've heard informally that C/CAG only ever approves capital improvement projects.

http://www.ccag.ca.gov/pdf/documents/Call%20For%20Project%20Letter_TDA%20Art3%20FY08.pdf

The City of San Mateo BPAC is considering a Bicycle Master Plan project. Many state and federal agencies require a master plan before they will fund capital projects. A plan will also help us identify new projects for TDA funding; in fact, objective #6 in the notice is to fund planned projects. The most expedient way for us to complete this plan is with TDA funds.

Would you please confirm that a Bicycle Master Plan is itself a legitimate TDA Article 3 project that can be considered for FY '08/09?

Thanks,
-Mark

cc: C/CAG BPAC please.